

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/612,065	07/03/2003	Hisahiro Higashi	239780US0DIV	3502
22850	7590 04/07/2004		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.			GUHARAY, KARABI	
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2879	

DATE MAILED: 04/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				KNS
		Application No.	Applicant(s)	100
Office Action Summary		10/612,065	HIGASHI ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Karabi Guharay	2879	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication ap or Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	
THE - External control	MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. misions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stature reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	.136(a). In no event, however, may a ply within the statutory minimum of thin It will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI te. cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communic BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ation.
Status				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on			
2a)	,	is action is non-final.		
3)[• •			s is
	closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposit	ion of Claims			
4)⊠	Claim(s) 2-6 is/are pending in the application.			
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.		
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>2-6</u> is/are rejected.			
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.		
Applicat	ion Papers			
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examin	ner.	•	
10)[The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
. —	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre		-	
11)[]	The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-152	2.
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority	nts have been received. nts have been received in A	Application No	
	application from the International Burea	au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	•	
*	See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	st of the certified copies no	t received.	
Attachmei	nt(s)	•		
1) Noti	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/03/03</u>.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____.

Application/Control Number: 10/612,065

Art Unit: 2879

Priority

This application is a divisional application of 09/623042, now patented US 6617051, which is a national stage of PCT/JP99/07201, filed December 22, 1999.

Preliminary amendment, filed on July 03, 2003 has been entered and claims 2-6 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

The various references are mentioned throughout the specification.

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

The information disclosure statement filed July 03, 2003 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of foreign patents mentioned in 1449; each publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Claim Objections

Claim 3 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper

Application/Control Number: 10/612,065

Art Unit: 2879

dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 3 depends from claim 2.

"Halogen containing compound" is not different from "halogen compound". Thus claim 3 fails to further limit the subject matter of previous claim 2, since "Halogen containing compound" of claim 2 is same as "halogen compound" of claim 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Woo et al. (US 6169163).

Regarding claims 2 & 3, Woo discloses an organic EL device that comprises organic compound layers including at least one organic emitting layer sandwiched between a pair of electrodes (lines 44-53 of column 20) wherein at least one organic compound is formed from an organic compound (polymers are used as luminescent material, lines 30-32 of column 1, & lines 6-9 of column 21). Example 5 describes the purification of the luminescent material 2,7-Dichloro-9,9-di (3-methyl-1-butyl) fluorene by HPLC, which is 99 percent or greater purity (see col. 23, lines 59-67). The degree of purity disclosed by Woo reads upon the purity level of instant claim. Since the reactive

Application/Control Number: 10/612,065

Art Unit: 2879

materials used to obtain the polymer are halogen (in this case, dichlorofluorene) any impurities from unreacted starting materials are halogen containing (see col. 23, lines 59-67, & Example 1, col. 22, lines 54-65). Example 1 describes that HPLC shows complete disappearance of the starting halogen compound (lines 63-65 of column 22), thus indicating almost 0 ppm of residual unreacted halogen compound.

Regarding claim 4, Woo discloses that in EL device, the organic compound layers are a hole injecting layer, an organic emitting layer and electron injection layer (see Col 51, Table 5).

Claims 5 & 6, are considered to be product-by-process claims, since drawn to a process of purifying the organic compound, which is incidental to the claimed organic compound.

Even though product by process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product. It is well established that a claimed apparatus cannot be distinguished over the prior art structure by a process limitation. Consequently, absent a showing of an unobvious difference between the claimed product and the prior art, the subject process limitation is not afforded patentable weight (see MPEP 2113).

Other Prior Art Cited

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Wettling et al. (US 5886209).

Page 5

Art Unit: 2879

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Karabi Guharay whose telephone number is (571) 272-2452. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30 am - 5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nimeshkumar D. Patel can be reached on (571) 272-2457. The fax phone number for the organization is (703) 308-7382.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Karabi Guharay Karabi Guharay Patent Examiner Art Unit 2879